



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/812,609

03/30/2004

Paul Re

H-US-01403CON

3229

50855

7590

05/12/2009

Tyco Healthcare Group LP
60 MIDDLETOWN AVENUE
NORTH HAVEN, CT 06473

EXAMINER

BACHMAN, LINDSEY MICHELE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3734

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/812,609	Applicant(s) RE ET AL.	
	Examiner LINDSEY BACHMAN	Art Unit 3734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,9,16,17 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,9,16,17 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 February 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 3, 9, 16, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulhauser, et al. (US Patent 6,267,772) in view of Frey et al. (US Patent 4,776,328) and Small et al. (US Patent 5,139,499).

Claims 1 and 3: Mulhauser'772 teaches a tissue repair device (10) containing a body containing an annular frame portion (14) and an integral, solid cover portion (12; column 4, lines 51-59) disposed within the frame portion (see side view in Figure 2b).

Art Unit: 3734

Further, the device contains legs or anchors (22). Mulhauser'722 teaches that the cover portion can be bowed proximally (column 3, lines 60-61). Mulahauser'772 does not teach that the legs are several times longer than the thickness of the body, are generally conical or that the legs contain central channels.

Frey teaches that it is known to provide anchors that are substantially longer in order to provide a stronger connection with the tissue. Further, Frey teaches that the anchors can be substantially conically shaped in order to prevent migration of the leg out of the tissue. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device taught by Mulhauser'772 so that it too has these advantages.

Mulhauser in view of Frey does not teach a leg or anchor with a central channel that extends substantially the length of the leg or anchor.

Small'499 teaches that it is old and well known to provide an anchor with a central channel (26) in order to engage with a delivery device (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Mulhauser in view of Frey with the teachings of Small so that it too has this advantage.

Claim 9: Mulhauser'772 teaches attaching the cover to the frame using insert molding (column 4, lines 26-34).

Claim 16: Mulhauser'772 teaches that the fabric can be made of absorbable material (column 4, lines 35-51).

Claim 17: Mulhauser'772 teaches that the cover can be a material which promotes cell growth (column 4, lines 35-51).

Claim 20: Mulhauser'772 teaches a method of repairing a cartilage defect that includes providing a body for disposition against a bone with a defect in which the device contains elongated leg structures (22) for disposition into the bone and bring the distal surface of the device into contact with the bone (column 7, lines 13-35 and column 3, lines 39-41). Mulhauser'722 teaches that the solid, cover portion (12; column 4, lines 51-59) can be bowed proximally (column 3, lines 60-61). Mulhauser'772 does not teach that the legs are several times larger than the thickness of the body, nor do the legs contain central channels that extend partially through the legs, nor is the cover member made of metal.

Frey teaches that it is known to provide legs that are substantially long in order to provide a stronger connection with the tissue. Further, Frey teaches that the legs can be substantially conically shaped in order to prevent migration of the leg out of the tissue. Frey also teaches that the legs may contain central channels (11) to aid in engaging the leg with a deployment tool (14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device taught by Mulhauser'772 so that it too has these advantages.

Mulhauser in view of Frey does not teach a leg structure with a central channel that extends substantially the length of the leg.

Small'499 teaches that it is old and well known to provide a leg structure with a central channel (26) in order to engage with a delivery device (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Mulhauser in view of Frey with the teachings of Small so that it too has this advantage.

Claim 1, 3, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herzog et al. (US Patent 6,187,009) in view of Small'499 and Mulhauser'772.

Claim 1, 3, 9, 16: Herzog'009 discloses a device that contains a body having a frame supporting a solid cover (1), a plurality of elongate leg structures (4) that are a plurality of magnitudes greater than the thickness of the body (see figures) and generally conical (see figure 2). The body contains a cover portion integral with the frame portion. The cover is bowed (see column 2, lines 59-62). further, the cover is bowed (see Figure 2, for example).

Herzog'009 does not teach generally conical legs containing a central channel that is closed at the distal end or an annular frame.

Small'499 teaches that it is old and well known to provide a leg structure with a central channel (26) in order to engage with a delivery device (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Herzog'009 with the teachings of Small so that it too has this advantage.

Mulhauser'772 teaches that it is old and well known to provide an annular shaped body for the purpose providing better structural support (column 4, lines 4-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device taught by Herzog'009 so that it too has this advantage.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINDSEY BACHMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-6208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 7:30 am to 5 pm, and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Manahan can be reached on 571-272-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3734

/TODD E MANAHAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3734